

Meeting Log: By Meeting and by Comment Number		
	Comment	Response
	it.	
M-10/5	An attendee asked what could happen if someone objected to the Policy chosen in the Final EIS/Policy ROD?	Persons objecting to the Policy Direction adopted by the BPA Administrator in the ROD could petition the Administrator to change his decision.
M-10/6	An attendee asked whether this EIS would trigger review on projects covered under existing EISs (e.g., the Spokane Tribal Hatchery EIS, completed years ago, but with the project itself ongoing). If there were significant changes to the existing hatchery project, how would that be handled?	Existing projects are covered under existing documents and processes, so changes to the project likely would be reviewed in a Supplemental Analysis linked to the original Spokane Hatchery EIS. The FWIP EIS could be used as additional information for making such a decision if it was found appropriate. However, if changes to the project represented a major departure from the project's original parameters, <i>and</i> the project was not consistent with the Policy Direction BPA chose, then another approach might be needed.

K.4 CROSSOVER COMMENTS: THE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN AND THE FWIP EIS

The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) issued Biological Opinions (BiOps) in December 2000 for the operation and maintenance of the Federal Columbia River Power System (FCRPS). The BiOps provide a flexible framework of performance standards for the FCRPS and other conservation measures over the 10-year period from 2000 to 2010. A series of rolling 5-year implementation plans, and a corresponding annual series of 1-year implementation plans were made part of the process. Five-year implementation plans provide the conceptual foundation and the management framework for coordinating actions to further recovery over the ensuing five years. One-year implementation plans summarize specific measures and provide detail on what is planned for the next fiscal year. These plans are intended to inform, and be informed by, other on-going state, tribal and regional planning efforts, such as the Northwest Power Planning Council's (Council's) Fish and Wildlife Program.

The first of these Plans was released for 2002 implementation by the Action Agencies and were discussed with states, tribes, and Columbia Basin stakeholders throughout the Region. Informal and formal comments were received through the NMFS Regional Forum, Regional Executive meetings, staff discussion, written letters, and other opportunities. Many of those comments were reflected in the actions included in the final Implementation Plan. The Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps, and BPA summarized and responded to key comments received in the draft Endangered Species Act 2003/2003-2007 Implementation Plan for the FCRPS (July 2002).

There were comments on the Implementation Plan directed at matters related to this EIS. Four letters submitted in response to the Implementation Plan were identical to the letters submitted as comments to the FWIP DEIS. These letters represented the comments of: 1) State of Idaho – Office of Species Conservation; 2) Committee of Nine & Idaho Water

Fish and Wildlife Implementation Plan EIS
Appendix K: Comments and Responses

Users; 3) Save Our Wild Salmon; and 4) Kootenai Tribe of Idaho. BPA has also incorporated many of the ideas from the comments on the Implementation Plan and included them in the Sample Implementation Action tables in Volume 3. The other related comments have been addressed in the following table.

Crossover Comments: Implementation Plan and the FWIP EIS		
Source	Comment	Response
Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks	[Recognize] the many 'tradeoffs' affecting resident fish resulting from actions taken for anadromous fish recovery.	We agree that there are tradeoffs that decisionmakers must consider, involving many of the issues affecting fish and wildlife mitigation and recovery, including resident and anadromous fish. This particular tradeoff is depicted by the impacts of the different alternatives on anadromous and resident fish in Sections: 5.2, 5.3, , and the Sample Implementation Actions in Volume 3 of this EIS.
Spokane Tribe of Indians	[Include] performance standards ... for categories of resources other than listed fish species ... to measure the incremental externalization effects of fish-recovery actions on non-target resources (for example, impacts on cultural resources caused by operating reservoirs for flow augmentation and flood control).	The impacts on cultural resources as a result of fish and wildlife mitigation and recovery actions are a very important consideration for decisionmakers. Accordingly, we have described this relationship in Sections 5.2 and 5.3 of this EIS.
Spokane Tribe of Indians	[Request] variances from Tribal, as well as State, water quality standards [in the event of an] inability to meet TDG water quality standard[s].	Please see the Umbrella Response to the Clean Water Act.
Spokane Tribe of Indians	[Do not rely on] the SOR ROD (1997) to cover operation of the FCRPS [as] the SOR NEPA process was seriously flawed, and invalid as to its assessment of impacts on cultural resources.	As noted in Section 1.3.3 of this EIS, the SOR EIS, along with many other NEPA processes, have been incorporated by reference. You will also note that the SOR EIS is referenced many times throughout the course of the analysis within this EIS. We recognize that cultural resources are an important consideration for decisionmakers regarding fish and wildlife mitigation and recovery issues. We also believe that, with the benefit of this EIS and subsequently tiered processes, decisionmakers will be adequately informed of the environmental consequences of their actions, including with respect to cultural resources. See the Umbrella Response regarding Tiered RODs.
The Shoshone-Bannock Tribes	[Analyze] the recovery benefits to returning river conditions to those that existed prior to construction of the dams ... for the entire FCRPS – not just the lower Snake dams.	This scenario would be best captured by the discussion and analysis on the Natural Focus Alternative within this EIS.
The Shoshone-Bannock Tribes	[Manage] human needs and FCRPS project purposes ... in accordance to the needs of the listed fish and aquatic resources.	To the extent that human needs are factored into the needs of fish and wildlife resources, the alternatives other than Natural Focus (i.e., Weak Stock and then Sustainable Use) begin to capture that balance incrementally. See Section 5.3 of this EIS for

Crossover Comments: Implementation Plan and the FWIP EIS		
Source	Comment	Response
		further analysis information.
Colville Confed- erated Tribes	[Extend] subbasin restoration ... beyond fish and wildlife science and [include] cultural, socioeconomic and tribal trust considerations.	We agree that any consideration of fish and wildlife mitigation and recovery actions must include an understanding of cultural, socioeconomic, and tribal issues. One of the main purposes of this EIS was to identify these relationships and evaluate the collective impacts. See Sections 5.1, 5.2, and 5.3 of this EIS.
Colville Confed- erated Tribes	[Enact] a more equitable division of recovery resources ... to allow restoration efforts in the Upper Columbia to balance with those of the rest of the basin.	Restoration of anadromous fish above Grand Coulee Dam is not a policy alternative in itself, but it is a potential mitigation and recovery action. It is one of many Sample Implementation Actions (Volume 3) for the different Policy Directions.
Save Our Wild Salmon (SOS) et al., Nicole Cordan	[Do not] refer to legal obligations as 'goals' that the agencies 'want to accomplish' The ESA, Clean Water Act, and the 1855 Treaty with the Columbia River Tribes each set forth specific legal obligations that must be met.	We agree and did not mean to imply that compliance with Federal law was optional. This EIS does, however, examine some alternatives that would require changes in existing law in order to be implemented, as described. As a policy-level document, the analysis is designed to serve the needs of the Region into the future; laws could change over time. Therefore, examining alternatives that are not in compliance with existing laws was deemed necessary under the circumstances. See Umbrella Response regarding Scope.
Public Power Council (Council), Robert Walton	Consider the potential impact of recent developments [such as] Judge Hogan's decision in <i>Alsea v. Evans</i> .	See Chapter 2, Section 2.3.2.3 of this EIS.
Public Power Council (Council), Robert Walton	Consider the potential implications ... if the [Pacific Decadal Oscillation] has now produced markedly increased ocean productivity.	<p>We agree that the ocean may likely play a dominant role in how many migrating juvenile salmon and steelhead return as adults, and that some stocks have experienced a dramatic increase in the past few years. The issue the Region faces is that the fish that are listed as endangered and threatened under the ESA are wild salmon and steelhead populations. Hatchery fish comprise about 80% of the returning adults.</p> <p>The effects of the FCRPS on the listed fish include changes in volume and timing of flow, and a small amount of mainstem habitat loss for fall chinook salmon. Our efforts in freshwater will be successful only if the favorable ocean conditions continue, but the factors that cause El Niños to return are not well understood and the timing is not predictable. The magnitude of the swift positive change in ocean conditions between 1998 and 1999 was not anticipated; we can only speculate when conditions will return to those of the early 1990's.</p> <p>An emerging understanding of an influence that may</p>

Crossover Comments: Implementation Plan and the FWIP EIS		
Source	Comment	Response
		further aggravate our work is global warming. The 1990's saw record high temperatures with one El Niño after another, instead of a decade of separation. If that scenario returns, we may be greatly frustrated in the attempt to maintain our present gains. Part of the answer is to continue the work in freshwater, but possibly more important is to gain an understanding of why some stocks survive better in the ocean than others. By gaining this insight, we might be able to improve ocean survival in good and bad years through improvements in areas such as freshwater habitat and timing of flow. See Appendix F for an overview of the ocean conditions issue.
Maia Genaus	[Include] all affected human parties in this process [in] a forum in which each affected human party can see all the other affected human parties, as well as the larger environmental picture.	Clearly a fundamental purpose for this EIS is to provide an opportunity for public involvement of interested parties. Review this Appendix for the many concerns and issues expressed by interested parties.
Bernie A. Swift	[Do not implement] the planned action ... strictly in conjunction with the ESA at the expense of farmers and the general public's need for water and electricity.	The commenter's preference for a regional policy direction is noted. The identified alternatives within this EIS represent points along the spectrum of potential policy directions. Each Policy Direction involves unique tradeoffs. This document identifies and discusses many of the important tradeoffs associated with each Policy Direction in order to more fully inform the public and decisionmaker as to the consequences of his/her actions.

K.5 THE SCOPING PROCESS

Preliminary scoping for this EIS began in 1998 with the Council's Multi-Species Framework Project. This project, which was managed by a Federal, state, and tribal committee, addressed mitigation and recovery for listed and non-listed fish and wildlife. When the Federal Caucus formed in 1999, scoping expanded to accommodate the "All-H" aspect of anadromous fish recovery. The formal scoping process for this EIS was initiated with a Notice of Intent on October 8, 1999 (64FR 56488-56489). The NOI was followed by a Notice of Scoping Meeting, December 22, 1999 (65FR 765-766). Scoping for this EIS was incorporated into the public meeting sessions for the All-H Paper (The Federal Caucus' Conservation of Columbia Basin Fish: Building a Conceptual Recovery Plan), as well as the Lower Snake River Juvenile Salmon Mitigation Feasibility Study and EIS and a report on John Day Dam Drawdown, both authored by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.⁹ An

⁹ See Chapter 1, Volume 1, of this EIS for a brief description of the documents and processes. The All-H Paper, the Lower Snake River Juvenile Salmon Mitigation Feasibility Study and FEIS, and the John Day Dam Drawdown Report were key documents and processes used in the preparation, including information and analysis, of this EIS and the Policy Directions alternatives.

amended Notice of Scoping was issued on February 18, 2000, announcing an additional scoping meeting on March 14, 2000, and extending the close of comment from February 29, 2000 to March 31, 2000. During scoping, interested parties were given the opportunity to comment on the range of actions, alternatives, and impacts to be included in the Fish and Wildlife Implementation Plan EIS.

The following is a list of the formal Scoping/Public Meetings that occurred:

February 3, 2000	Portland, Oregon
February 8, 2000	Spokane, Washington
February 10, 2000	Lewiston, Idaho
February 15, 2000	Astoria, Oregon
February 17, 2000	Tri-Cities (Pasco), Washington
February 23, 2000	Boise, Idaho
February 29, 2000	Seattle, Washington
March 1, 2000	Kalispell Montana
March 2, 2000	Missoula, Montana
March 6, 2000	Ketchikan, Alaska
March 7, 2000	Idaho Falls, Idaho
March 7, 2000	Sitka, Alaska
March 8, 2000	Twin Falls, Idaho
March 8, 2000	Juneau, Alaska
March 9, 2000	Petersburg, Alaska
March 14, 2000	Portland, Oregon

The joint public involvement process:

- yielded 60,000 Comments
- attracted 9,000 Attendees
- included 15 Meetings
- involved 9 Participating Agencies
- spanned 6 Weeks
- covered 5 States

K.6 COMMENTERS' LETTERS

For a listing of comment letters, see Table A on page 10.